

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| In re Application of: |) | |
| |) | |
| Michael A MALCOLM et al. |) | Examiner: Dang, Hung Q. |
| |) | |
| Serial No.: 10/801,091 |) | Art Unit: 2621 |
| |) | |
| Filed: March 15, 2004 |) | Conf. No: 9493 |
| |) | |
| For: Remote Playback of Ingested |) | |
| Media Content |) | |
| |) | |

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In the Office Action mailed December 13, 2007 the Examiner has stated that the present Application contains two distinct inventions. As such, the Examiner has required Applicants to elect a single invention for prosecution on the merits. Specifically, the Examiner has required Applicants to elect between a first invention, (Invention I recited in Claims 1-61 and 63-75) and a second invention (Invention II recited in Claims 76-77 and 79-102). The present Office Action indicates that inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice.

Amendments to the Claims begin on page 2; applicants' remarks begin on page 25.